



ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

NOTICE is hereby given that the **PLANNING COMMISSION** of Alpine City, Utah will hold an **Electronic Meeting** on **Tuesday, August 18, 2020 at 7:00 pm.**

The public may view and participate in the meeting via the **Alpine City YouTube Channel**. A direct link to the channel can be found on the home page of the Alpine City website: alpinecity.org

Public Comments may be submitted to admin@alpinecity.org Comments for an item on the agenda may be submitted during the meeting and **comments for an item not on the agenda must be submitted by 5:00 pm the day of the meeting.**

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| A. Welcome and Roll Call: | Jane Griener |
| B. Prayer/Opening Comments: | Sylvia Christiansen |
| C. Pledge of Allegiance: | Alan MacDonald |

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Any person wishing to comment on any item not on the agenda may address the Planning Commission at this point by Submitting a public comment to admin@alpinecity.org and include his or her name and address for the record.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Discussion – General Plan and Land Use Regulations – Intermunicipal Connecting Streets

Planning Commission will continue discussion on updates to the Transportation Element of the General Plan.

B. Discussion – Training Materials

Planning Commission will review and discuss draft training materials.

C. Discussion – Building Code and Ordinance Issues

The Mayor has proposed changes to City code and ordinances, Planning Commission will review and discuss.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: August 4, 2020

ADJOURN

Chair Jane Griener
August 14, 2020

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO ATTEND ALL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS. If you need a special accommodation to participate in the meeting, please call the City Recorder's Office at 801-756-6347 ext. 5.

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING. The undersigned duly appointed recorder does hereby certify that the above agenda notice was posted at Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT. It was also sent by e-mail to The Daily Herald located in Provo, UT a local newspaper circulated in Alpine, UT. This agenda is also available on the City's web site at www.alpinecity.org and on the Utah Public Meeting Notices website at www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html.

PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING ETIQUETTE

Please remember all public meetings and public hearings are now recorded.

- All comments **must** be recognized by the Chairperson and addressed through the microphone.
- When speaking to the Planning Commission, please stand, speak slowly and clearly into the microphone, and state your name and address for the recorded record.
- Be respectful to others and refrain from disruptions during the meeting. Please refrain from conversation with others in the audience as the microphones are very sensitive and can pick up whispers in the back of the room.
- Keep comments constructive and not disruptive.
- Avoid verbal approval or dissatisfaction of the ongoing discussion (i.e., booing or applauding).
- Exhibits (photos, petitions, etc.) given to the City become the property of the City.
- Please silence all cellular phones, beepers, pagers or other noise making devices.
- Be considerate of others who wish to speak by limiting your comments to a reasonable length, and avoiding repetition of what has already been said. Individuals may be limited to two minutes and group representatives may be limited to five minutes.
- Refrain from congregating near the doors or in the lobby area outside the council room to talk as it can be very noisy and disruptive. If you must carry on conversation in this area, please be as quiet as possible. (The doors must remain open during a public meeting/hearing.)

Public Hearing vs. Public Meeting

If the meeting is a **public hearing**, the public may participate during that time and may present opinions and evidence for the issue for which the hearing is being held. In a public hearing there may be some restrictions on participation such as time limits.

Anyone can observe a **public meeting**, but there is no right to speak or be heard there - the public participates in presenting opinions and evidence at the pleasure of the body conducting the meeting.

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

**SUBJECT: Discussion – General Plan and Land Use Regulations –
Intermunicipal Connecting Streets**

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: 18 August 2020

PETITIONER: Mayor and City Council

**ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Review draft language and provide
feedback to staff.**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

On July 14, 2020, the City Council adopted Resolution 2020-09, which began the process of amending the City's General Plan and land use ordinances as they pertain to streets and roads going in and out of the City. On August 4, 2020 the Planning Commission discussed new language for the Transportation Element of the General Plan. The City Attorney has reviewed the proposed language and provided feedback for discussion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Review and discuss draft feedback.



TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC CIRCULATION

GOAL #1

Create and maintain a multi-modal transportation system that is pedestrian friendly, safe and efficient.



POLICIES

- 1.1 Promote safe and efficient traffic circulation by following the Street Master Plan.
- 1.2 Connect neighborhoods and open spaces of the City with appropriate trails, sidewalks and bike lanes that support alternate forms of local transportation and recreation.
- 1.3 Work with adjacent communities and other agencies to acquire financial aid for transportation improvements. ~~and regional integration.~~
- 1.4 Emphasize the maintenance of roads to ensure a high quality road system.
- 1.5 Promote the use of roundabouts or other traffic flow options to prevent the need for stop lights therefore maintaining the historic small-town rural atmosphere.
- 1.6 Intermunicipal street connections shall be limited to existing planned connections only. Street connections to other municipalities outside the city boundaries must be compatible with the goals and policies of the General Plan and shall require City

Council approval and an update to the General Plan, Street Master Plan, and applicable ordinances.

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

SUBJECT: Discussion – Training Materials

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: 18 August 2020

PETITIONER: Chair of Planning Commission

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Review and discuss draft training materials.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

In July 2020, City Councilwoman Jessica Smuin shared specific training videos with the Planning Commission. Planning Commissioner Alan MacDonald has since drafted training material, based on these videos, for discussion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Review and discuss draft training materials.

[Initial Draft: For Review and Comment Only]

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Training Materials

PART 1. What Hat Do We Wear?

All local land use and zoning decisions involve three areas of decision-making:

- Legislative decisions
- Administrative decisions
- Quasi-judicial decisions

Legislative function: Makes the law. This requires taking policy (what local citizens want) and turning those desires into law, in the form of ordinances. Examples include changing the general plan, adopting or amending ordinances, and annexation. Only an elected body such as a City Council has the authority to pass laws. However, it is the job of a Planning Commission to create and recommend a General Plan to the City Council. It is also a core duty of a Planning Commission to create and recommend changes to zoning and land use ordinances.

Administrative function: Applies the law. This arises once ordinances are passed. It applies these ordinances to different individuals and circumstances. For example, if a land use application is made, the administrative role is to apply the existing land-use law to that application. There are no policy considerations in an administrative function; it is assumed those decisions were already made in the legislative process. Examples include subdivision applications, conditional use permits and building permits. Administrative decision can be made by any party that the legislative body appoints, often in the form of city officials and/or a Planning Commission.

Quasi-judicial function: Interprets the law. This function arises when a dispute over the law or its application occurs. Local governments typically appoint a person or body to handle this role, known as a local appeal authority.

PART 2. Planning Commission: How to Apply the Law to Our Decisions and Meetings

The duties of a Planning Commission include both legislative and administrative functions (if delegated to it.) The three main duties of a Planning Commission are to:

1. Create and recommend changes to the General Plan
2. Create and recommend changes to Ordinances
3. Handle assigned administrative matters if delegated to do so

Create a General Plan. Utah law states that a Planning Commission's duty is to make a General Plan, and amendments thereto, and recommend the Plan (or amendments) to the City Council.

The Plan is the Commission's recommendation for what a community should be. It is an ongoing process that requires work, time and care. This duty to plan represents one part of a Planning Commission's legislative role. The Commission is helping to make the law.

Create Zoning and Ordinance Changes. The second duty, after planning, is to make recommendations to the City Council regarding zoning and land use ordinance changes. This is also a legislative role. Zoning decisions and amending the code make the law. The Planning Commission's job is to discuss, consider, draft and recommend land use regulations and amendments. By law, a City Council may not adopt or amend a land use regulation without a recommendation from a Planning Commission. Refining the City's land use code is a constant, ongoing effort to make it better, clearer, easier, and compliant with ever-changing state law.

A properly functioning Planning Commission will spend most of its time on these two legislative roles.

Handle Administrative Matters if Delegated. Planning Commission's role may be to make administrative decisions. These decisions do not change the law, but merely apply it to individual land use applications such as conditional use applications or subdivision approvals. The Planning Commission only has these administrative functions if the City Council has delegated them. City staff can also fill this role. It is up to the City Council to decide what works best.

Administrative functions are important, but they are not the core role of a Planning Commission. Nothing in the state code gives the administrative role to a Planning Commission; however, if that role is given in the local code, it must be done promptly, diligently and in careful accordance with the law.

PART 3. Working with Public Input

The power of a local government to make and enforce land-use laws is not inherent. It is specifically delegated to them by the state. Land use power is derived from the police power, to protect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens. The local government, however, has great discretion to decide what it wants its town to be, and accordingly what zoning and land use laws it will adopt. Our system gives local governments power to tell people what they can or can't do on their land, in the interests of the public good. However, to do this, the Council must formally pass ordinances and abide by them in uniform decision-making.

With regard to public hearing requirements, state law makes a distinction between legislative and administrative functions.

Legislative function. The public's role in this process is critical. The City Council is a legislative body, elected by and accountable to the public, and they should listen to the public tell them what they want their town to be. Thus, when a legislative decision is being made, the public has a right to speak. Likewise, state law requires that a Planning Commission hold at least one public

hearing when considering a legislative decision or function. The public must be allowed to speak in any meeting designated for a public hearing.

Administrative function. State law does not require a public hearing for administrative decisions. It only requires a public meeting. However, a local ordinance may require a public hearing for administrative functions. Public opinion is relevant for legislative decisions, but not for administrative functions. The only relevant consideration for administrative application of an ordinance is whether the proposed use or application complies with the ordinance. If it does, the answer is yes. Administrative decisions must be based on substantial evidence.

What should a Planning Commission do when the public shows up clamoring over an administrative decision? Recommended options:

1. Not hold a public hearing for every administrative action, unless required by local ordinance.
2. Make sure we, as a Commission, understand the difference between public clamor and evidence.
3. Try to educate the public regarding their role and how to best fulfill it. Educate the public on the difference between legislative and administrative functions. Let the public know that clamor is unhelpful at the administrative stage. Evidence, not opinion, is what is required.

In summary, opinion is helpful and encouraged on legislative functions. However, as to administrative decisions, only substantial evidence should matter to the Commission as it seeks to apply the law to the situation. Managing this process and avoiding making administrative decisions based on public clamor is one of the best ways to make a correct and legally supportable decision.

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

SUBJECT: Discussion – Building Code and Ordinance Issues

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: 18 August 2020

PETITIONER: Mayor

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Review and discuss outlined issues.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Mayor Stout would has asked that the Planning Commission review and discuss potential building code and ordinance issues with the goal of protecting the qualities of Alpine City and it's neighborhoods for the future. A number of specific issues have been outlined for discussion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Review and discuss outlined issues.

Building Code & Ordinance Issues

Changes in Measuring Structure Height

- Should be measured from original/natural grade, not allowing artificial buildup (Unless building on existing grade of xx% of slope, then modify accordingly)
- Evaluate changes to current measuring to "midline" of roof
- Look at basement wall height allowances, which are used to increase height
- Look at max height as it relates to minimum setback from the street (Should we allow a home to rise to maximum height without depth or dimension next to the sidewalk or road?)
- Monolithic structures that occupy an entire lot, rising to max height, wrapping around the corner to create a 30' wall

Garage Doors On Frontage

- Size and number of "RV-style" doors on frontage (limit to 1 or 2 on street)
- Total number of garage doors as percentage of building on frontage

Lighting

- Total number of lights projecting from building (soffits and structure)
- Total wattage/lumens allowed to project from structure or property
- Limit "influence" of lighting: no projection onto sidewalk, street or across property lines
- Limit hours of full light to 10:00 pm, similar to noise ordinances (reduce to minimum levels after 10)
- Look at other city (Park City, Midway, Boulder, etc.) lighting ordinances to see how far they go to contain light pollution
- I want to make the lighting laws retroactive to the extent the law allows us to do so. We are going to dim the lights in Alpine!

Recreational Structures

- Setbacks for "natural" or artificial features that rise above the fence line into neighbors' field of view
- Ratio of rec. structure as compared to dwelling should be strict
- Re-evaluate height restrictions
- Elevation and setbacks for swimming pools

Artificially Increasing Driveway Slope

- Max grade increase should be imposed (will likely be redundant to new grade language, which is good)
- Setback should be increased commensurate with slope increase
- No use of retaining walls to facilitate (engineered) steeper driveway

Massive Additions (by lot acquisition or on existing)

- Automatic increase in setback and dimensional requirements (roofline) when monolithic building stretches from border to border
- Stricter guidelines on building being more congruent with others in the area, and with the original structure
- Look at limiting addition square footage, not to exceed xx% of original structure
- When acquiring neighboring lot for expansion, require additional setback and smaller building envelope
- Evaluate language regarding "addition" vs. auxiliary building, and how the two attach to the original structure

ALPINE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Minutes August 4, 2020

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: 18 August 2020

PETITIONER: Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Approve Minutes

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Minutes from the August 4, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Review and approve the Planning Commission Minutes.

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT
August 4, 2020

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Roll Call: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairwoman Jane Griener. The following were present and constituted a quorum:

Chairman: Jane Griener

Commission Members: Ed Bush, Ethan Allen, John MacKay, Alan MacDonald, Troy Slade,

Excused: Sylvia Christiansen

Staff: Austin Roy, Jed Muhlestein, Marla Fox

Others:

B. Prayer/Opening Comments: Troy Slade

C. Pledge of Allegiance: Ed Bush

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Austin Roy read a public comment from Benton Collins. Mr. Collins had concerns about Sycamore Lane being a busy Thorofare with many people speeding and people not stopping at the stop sign. He said this jeopardizes the health and wellbeing of the citizens and the children walking to school. Currently there are no speed limit signs on Sycamore Lane. He would like to recommend a three way stop sign at the intersection of Long Drive and Sycamore Drive, and a speed limit sign be installed. He is also concerned about parking for sporting events at the Jr. High school. He said many people are coming from out of town and do not respect the surrounding area. He said they litter and urinate in the street. He suggests installing a higher fence around the Jr. High to limit access and to place no parking signs on Long Drive and surrounding side streets. These signs should have verbiage that states violators will be ticketed or towed. Mr. Collins also suggested reducing the amount of sporting events held at the Jr. High School.

Austin Roy said he would forward the message to the City Council and Jane Griener said she would respond to Mr. Collins and let him know.

Alan MacDonald said football season will bring even more traffic leaving little room to get through. He said at Burgess Park, the City painted one curb on one side of the road red to keep parking to just one side of the road.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Discussion – General Plan and Land Use Regulations – Intermunicipal Connecting Streets

Austin Roy said on July 14, 2020, the City Council adopted Resolution 2020-09, which began the process of amending the City's General Plan and land use ordinances as they pertain to streets and roads going in and out of the City.

Staff have drafted some language as a proposed update to the general plan for discussion and feedback.

Austin Roy said Staff have written additional language for review.

1.3 Take out the verbiage: *and regional integration.*

1 1.6 New street connections to other municipalities or areas outside the City boundaries shall be
2 conditional at the City Council's discretion and require an update to the General Plan, Street Master Plan,
3 and applicable ordinances.

4 1.7 Preserve the closed nature of Alpine City by limiting intermunicipal connecting streets to existing
5 planned connections only.

6 1.8 Connections to outside municipalities shall only be allowed if the City Council finds that proposed
7 connections are compatible with the goals and policies of the City General Plan.

8 Jane Griener and Ed Bush both said they agreed with taking *regional integration* out because it could
9 look like we're trying to connect with other cities, and it could be interpreted in many ways.

10 Ed Bush said he thought we should ask the City Attorney about 1.6 because the way it's worded, it
11 sounds like being conditional on the City Council's discretion it seems to imply that they could override
12 land use laws.

13 Ed Bush had reservations about the comment in 1.7 about the closed nature of Alpine City. He thought
14 we should approach it in the nature of traffic flow and safety and emergency access roads not relying on
15 other cities. Alan MacDonald and Jane Griener agreed.

16 Alan MacDonald said the General Plan indicates that the very obligation of the City Council is to
17 preserve views, look out for the public safety, and other data points. He said we need a policy statement
18 to parrot the stated obligations of the City Council with respect to health, safety, welfare, open spaces,
19 view corridors, etc. and incorporate those into these policies.

20 Jane Griener said she thinks its overkill to have three more points. She said our main goal is to maintain
21 the small-town, rural atmosphere that embraces agricultural uses, open spaces, and the mountains
22 surrounding the city. She said this is the overarching theme of each of these elements is to serve the
23 citizens but to also maintain the reason why people came to Alpine. She said in 1.5 it says to beautify the
24 three gateways into the city and do so in a way that you know you are entering Alpine.

25 The Planning Commission talked about traffic and safety. Jane Griener said we will always have an A
26 rating because the traffic studies lump all roads into the same category and calculate how long you have
27 to wait at a stop sign. She said she feels like there should be a better way to calculate traffic because all
28 roads are not the same.

29 Austin Roy said you want to be cautious using the safety reasoning because if you're in the hillside
30 community and there's a wildfire, you could use that as an argument for municipal connections.

31 Jane Griener said on 1.6 to take out *City Council's discretion* and say conditional on *City Council*
32 *approval and an update to the General Plan, Street Master Plan, and any applicable ordinances.*

33 The Planning Commission had a discussion on stub streets shown on the Street Master Plan. They said
34 the stub streets that are on the map will be residential streets and not gateway roads. Austin Roy showed
35 on a map where the current stub streets are located in the city.

1 Jane Griener said any road or stub street that is not already on the Street Master Plan should have to meet
2 1.6.

3 Alan MacDonald said to combine 1.6 and 1.8 to say: *Street connections to other municipalities outside*
4 *the city boundaries must be compatible with the goals and policies of the General Plan, and shall require*
5 *City Council approval and an update to the General Plan, Street Master Plan, and applicable*
6 *ordinances.*

7 Ed Bush said if a developer wanted to bring in a new street, he didn't think this language could stop them
8 because new streets are building built within subdivisions all the time. Austin Roy said our Street Master
9 Plan is a living document that is constantly updated. He said we've made changes over the years as
10 annexations have occurred, as new subdivisions come in, and the city gets built out.

11 Jed Muhlestein said all new streets that get approved are added to the Street Master Plan. Ed Bush said it
12 seems like the Street Master Plan is a re-active document rather than a pro-active document. Jed
13 Muhlestein said he disagrees with that. He said there are some residential streets that are key and are
14 shown on the Master Plan as future. He said arterial and collector roads are also shown on the Street
15 Master Plan. He said those have been planned out through a transportation study that Hordock's
16 Engineering did for the city. He said its definitely not re-active. The residential streets that are typically
17 added to the subdivision process are allowed by ordinance to be created. If a development is created
18 where a collector road ran through that area, then we require them to build that road as part of the
19 development. This would make them follow the Master Plan for that development.

20 Jed Muhlestein said a resident commented earlier in Public Comment about Sycamore Lane being a
21 residential street not meant for a lot of traffic. Jed Muhlestein said Sycamore Lane is actually a collector
22 street and it is intended for higher volumes of traffic.

23 Jed Muhlestein said to Ed Bush's point, smaller roads in new developments may be re-active, but many
24 roads have been planned for and are on the Street Master Plan.

25 Ed Bush said his fear was that he didn't think 1.6 was strong enough. He said 1.6 says it has to comply
26 with the General Plan, it has to be approved by the City Council, and then if it is approved, we would
27 have to update our plan. The only thing it says is that it has to be compatible and fit with the goal and
28 policies of the General Plan.

29 The Planning Commission said they would like to receive guidance from the City Attorney, David
30 Church.

31 Ed Bush suggested alternative language to 1.7 which states: *Street connections shall be limited to*
32 *intermunicipal street connections and shall be limited to existing plan connections only.*

33 The Planning Commission said they wanted to combine 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8 into one new point. They said to
34 combine what Ed Bush and Alan MacDonald wrote.

35 *Street connections shall be limited to intermunicipal street connections and shall be limited to existing*
36 *plan connections only. Street connections to other municipalities outside the city boundaries must be*

1 *compatible with the goals and policies of the General Plan and shall require City Council approval and*
 2 *an update to the General Plan, Street Master Plan, and applicable ordinances.*

3 **B. Ordinance 2020 -13: Retaining Wall Drip Irrigation**

4 Austin Roy said this item is returning to the Planning Commission after the City Council had concerns
 5 with City having responsibility for the maintenance of retaining wall drip irrigation systems.

6 The Development Code requires plantings on terraced retaining walls. Among the requirements is that the
 7 plants/shrubs shall be watered via drip irrigation. Staff are recommending revised language to clarify
 8 responsibility of drip irrigation installation and operation per feedback from the City Council.

9 Austin Roy said the city staff is small and this could put a burden on them to take on this additional work.

10 Austin Roy said the proposed language to take out is:

- 11 1. *Shrubs shall be watered by drip irrigation to minimize erosion by property owner, not by*
 12 *Alpine City,*
- 13 2. *Where no HOA is present,*
- 14 3. *Alpine City will*

15 Austin Roy said by taking out this language, the responsibility to drip irrigate will be on the property owner
 16 and not the City.

17
 18 Alan MacDonald asked if we have a definition for drought resistant vegetation. He said developers should
 19 have some type of guidance so they can comply with the ordinance. He said we should also get rid of the
 20 phrase *and when possible*. Austin Roy said our Tree Guide may have a definition. Jed Muhlestein said
 21 that guide is for trees and not shrubs. Jane Griener said we could put a list of drought resistant shrubs on
 22 our website. Jed Muhlestein said we could say: *Drought resistant shrubs shall be drip irrigated.*

23
 24 Jed Muhlestein said there are some areas that don't have pressurized irrigation and that should be
 25 eliminated. Austin Roy said we should just say the shrubs have to be drip irrigated and leave it at that.

26
 27 Jane Griener said we should put in there something about replacing dead shrubs.

28
 29
 30 **MOTION:** Ethan Allen moved to recommend Ordinance 2020-13: Retaining Wall Drip Irrigation be
 31 approved with this language given by Jed Muhlestein to say:

32 *Drought resistant shrubs shall be drip irrigated to minimize water usage. The responsibility of drip*
 33 *irrigation resides with the property owner on which the majority of the structure is built. If the majority*
 34 *of the structure is built on private or public open space, an irrigation service and drip irrigation system*
 35 *shall be installed by the Developer. The Developer is responsible for the drip irrigation maintenance,*
 36 *establishment of vegetation, and cost of operation until the warranty period expires; after which the*
 37 *responsibility lies with the owner(s) of the property.*

38 Ethan Allen then wanted to add the verbiage of adding drought resistant shrubs earlier in the document.

39 Ed Bush seconded the motion. This motion was not voted on.

40

1 **MOTION:** Ed Bush moved to recommend Ordinance 2020-13: Retaining Wall Drip Irrigation be
2 approved with this language given by Jed Muhlestein to say:

3 *Drought resistant shrubs shall be drip irrigated to minimize water usage. The responsibility of drip*
4 *irrigation resides with the property owner on which the majority of the structure is built. If the majority*
5 *of the structure is built on private or public open space, an irrigation service and drip irrigation system*
6 *shall be installed by the Developer. The Developer is responsible for the drip irrigation maintenance,*
7 *establishment of vegetation, and cost of operation until the warranty period expires; after which the*
8 *responsibility lies with the owner(s) of the property.*

9 Ed Bush added language in Section F to say: A minimum of five drought resistant shrubs.

10 Alan MacDonald seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion
11 passed unanimously.

12
13 **Ayes:**
14 Ed Bush
15 Ethan Allen
16 John MacKay
17 Jane Griener
18 Alan MacDonald
19 Troy Slade
20

Nays:
None

21 **IV. Communication**

22 Austin Roy said the next Planning Commission meeting will be on August 18, 2020.

23
24 Jane Griener said Alan MacDonald has put together a training document and he would like to review it with
25 the Planning Commission to discuss it further.

26
27 Jane Griener asked Austin Roy if he could find other training information that could be added to Alan's
28 information. She would like to see this as an agenda item at the next meeting. She asked the Planning
29 Commission members to read what Alan MacDonald provided and bring ideas to the meeting.

30
31 **V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: July 21, 2020**

32
33 **MOTION:** Alan MacDonald moved to approve the minutes for July 21, 2020, with changes by Sylvia
34 Christiansen and Ed Bush.

35
36 Line 29 change vote to 4 ayes and 3 nays

37
38 Line 11 change to combining lots

39
40 John MacKay seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed
41 unanimously.

42
43 **Ayes:**
44 Ed Bush
45 Ethan Allen
46 John MacKay

Nays:
None

1 Jane Griener
2 Alan MacDonald
3 Troy Slade
4

5 **MOTION:** Ed Bush moved to adjourn the meeting.

6
7 Alan MacDonald seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion
8 passed unanimously.
9

10 **Ayes:**

11 Ed Bush
12 Ethan Allen
13 John MacKay
14 Jane Griener
15 Alan MacDonald
16 Troy Slade
17

Nays:

None

18 The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

DRAFT